

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 19, 2008, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are amended. With no claims being added or canceled, claims 1-11 are now pending in this application.

35 USC§101 Rejection of the Claims

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 11 be withdrawn and such claims be allowed. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of amended independent claims 1 and 6, so they should also be found allowable.

35 USC§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hinckley et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0140984) in view of Kelts (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0030667).

Hinckley et al. in paragraph 0034 describes "if the user is holding the finger down on the active region 102, and the Ctrl key is later pushed while the finger is still held down on the active region 102, then the system 200 may immediately recognize this gesture as requesting the document to be paged in the up direction". Further, Hinckley et al. in paragraph 0068 describes "automatic scrolling" and "portion of the scrolling region 101 (not just the middle) may be used as a reference from which to measure the absolute position of the finger for purposes of automatic scrolling rate determination". Furthermore, Hinckley et al. paragraph 0069 describes "Auto-Scrolling Rate Determination, Such as Based on Finger Pressure or Contact Area". In

addition, Hinckley et al., in paragraph 0070, describes “fixed rate of scrolling and/or a variable rate of scrolling based on various factors such as finger speed, finger pressure/contact area, length of hold, number of taps, and/or frequency of taps”.

Kelts in paragraph 0070 describes “In accordance with one aspect of the present invention, map 108 can be navigated and traversed in an intuitive and easy manner”. Further, Kelts describes “The user may engage navigation bar **104** for purposes of zooming and panning”. Furthermore, Kelts describes “the user can direct the displayed cursor to a specific region of map 108 and select that region (e.g., by clicking the mouse button) to center map 108 about that region or to magnify map 108 about that region. For example, the user can select the Sports is land 120 to automatically zoom and reposition or re-center map 108 to focus on that region. Such zooming and repositioning may also be controlled by external events that do not require the user to initiate a zoom or re-center command”.

In contrast, amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11 recite “presenting at least a part of the document on a display screen”, “said **part being determined by a position of a focal point within the document and by a zoom factor with respect to at least one coordinate direction**”, “**adjusting the position of the focal point in response to a user-supplied scroll command**”, and “**automatically adjust the zoom factor in dependence upon an aspect of said scroll command**”. Support for the above language can be found in page 6, lines 1-7 and lines 14-34, page 7, lines 7-26, page 8, lines 22-31, page 9, lines 2-5 and FIGS. 2-6. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of amended independent claims 1 and 6. So they should also be found allowable.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Hinckley et al. and Kelts references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the cited references in combination fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant’s invention, such as “presenting at least a part of the document on a display screen”, “said part being determined by a position of a focal point within the document and by a zoom factor with respect to at least one coordinate direction”, “adjusting the position of the focal point in response to a user-supplied scroll command”, and “automatically adjust

the zoom factor in dependence upon an aspect of said scroll command".

For the above reasons, claims 1-11 should be allowable over Hinckley et al. and Kelts references and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections and/or rejections of record, allow all the pending claims 1-11, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's attorney Eric Bram (Senior IP Counsel, Philips Intellectual Property and Standards, 345 Scarborough Road, Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001) at 914-333-9635.

Respectfully submitted,

Paulus Cornelis Neervoort

By his Representatives,

Global IP Services, PLLC
10 Crestwood Lane
Nashua, NH 03062
Phone: 603-888-7958

Date: December 17, 2008

By



Prakash Nama
Reg. No. 44,255